

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	IG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,115	08/08/2003		Haijun Yuan	AVA-P007	3827
47389	7590 08/10/2006			EXAMINER	
PATTERSC	N & SHE	VU, PHU			
3040 POST (ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 1500 HOUSTON,			2871		
				DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/637,115	YUAN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Phu Vu	2871					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet i	vith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a by within the statutory minimum of the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC a. cause the application to become a	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. \$ 133)					
Status							
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowa	<u> </u>						
Disposition of Claims		•					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-14</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-14</u> is/are rejected.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	nnce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Silberberg 20030194165

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, 3-4, and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silberberg 20030194165 in view of Bouevitch 20030035605.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 11, Silberberg teaches a C-polarizer having a birefringent crystal having a first a face and a second receiving a collimated beam and separating the collimated beam into a P polarization beam and an S-polarization beam (see fig. 20 element 312).

Silberberg also teaches a waveplate (319) coupled to the second face of the crystal for rotating the S-polarization beam by 90 degrees, thereby causing the rotated S-polarization beam to have the same polarization as the P polarization beam and a liquid crystal tunable filter (340) for receiving the P and rotated S polarization beam from

Art Unit: 2871

the C-Polarizer wherein the P and rotated S polarization beam are separate from one another.

Silberberg omits the teaching the beam waists of the P and S polarization beams are located substantially at the beam waist of a liquid crystal cavity of the filter however, Bouevitch discloses that locating a liquid crystal cavity at the beam waist of a laser in order to increase channel bandwidth of the laser (see [0119]). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the beam waist at a liquid crystal cavity in order to increase channel bandwidth.

Regarding claim 3, 8, and 12, Silberberg teaches a beam collimator (322) coupled to the first surface of the C polarizer, the beam collimator providing a minimal space separation between the P polarization beam and rotated S beam.

Regarding claim 4, since the polarization states are matched prior with respect to polarization states prior to entering the LC and pass through the LC cell than this limitation is met.

Regarding claims 9 and 13, matching the alignment of the LC filter in the direction of the liquid crystal (see fig. 4) as the liquid crystal in the filter is aligned as aligning does not imply any structure as there is no structure set forth without a limitation of exactly how these are aligned, therefore, the device is considered aligned (see fig. 20).

Regarding claims 10 and 14, Silberberg disclose a liquid crystal device with electrodes that produce a voltage across a liquid crystal layer which affects the S and P polarization beams (se claim 24).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silberberg in view of Bouevitch and further in view Tsai 2002/0122444.

Regarding claim 5 and 6, the reference teaches all the limitations of claim 6 except a photodiode or a bi-cell photodiode having a first cell and a second cell, the first cell for receiving the P polarization beam, the second cell of the bi-cell photodiode receiving the rated S-polarization beam. Silberberg teaches an optical fiber further directing the beam to some sort of optical detector [0147] however omits the type of detector used. Tsai teaches an optical filtering system that teaches bi-cell photodiodes are conventional detection mechanisms [0048]. Conventionality has associative benefits as lower cost, ready availability. Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply bi-cell photodiodes to gain benefits of conventionality.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/637,115

Art Unit: 2871

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phu Vu whose telephone number is (571)-272-1562.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571)-272-1787. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu Vu Examiner AU 287

ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5